

MEETING HIGHLIGHTS
Hanford Site Technology Coordination Group
Management Council

EESB Snoqualmie Room
Wednesday, April 16, 1997
8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

Purpose

- To learn about the TDI process, the STCG's role, and the Hanford proposal concepts;
- To establish the framework for the STCG as recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee.

Outcomes

- Understanding and endorsement of the TDI proposal concepts;
- Understanding and endorsement of the revised STCG mission, scope and Management Council roles and responsibilities.

Agenda Items

- Introduction/Safety/Continuous Process Improvement
- Updates
 - C-Reactor Technology Demonstrations
 - Communications Committee Report
 - Use of DoD Facilities as Technology Test Beds
 - National STCG Meeting
- Oregon Office of Energy Membership - VOTE
 - A vote was held to decide if the STCG should add a voting member to represent the Oregon Office of Energy. There was unanimous agreement.
- TDI Process, STCG Role, and Proposal Concepts - VOTE
 - Dave Biancosino gave an overview of the TDI process. A vote was held to determine endorsement of the TDI proposal concepts, and all but two were endorsed. The issues related to the remaining two proposals were to be worked offline.
- Ad Hoc Committee - VOTE
 - This agenda item was tabled until the next meeting.

- Wrap-Up
 - The next meeting will be held on May 21, 1997, from 8:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. in the EESB Snoqualmie Room.

Actions

- Debbie Trader will arrange for an external affairs person from PNNL to attend STCG meetings.
- Shannon Saget will draft a letter for Lloyd Piper's signature to Mike Graney (OOE) to designate an official STCG Management Council member.
- Dave Biancosino will communicate to DOE-HQ the need to include contingent liabilities and long-term costs (including land costs) in next year's TDI cost analysis methodology.
- Dave Biancosino will provide a time line for Tom Engel showing when DOE-RL first heard about TDI and when industry was involved.
- A task force will be commissioned to look at prioritization criteria for technology demonstration and/or deployment.
- Shannon Saget will discuss with Lloyd Piper the need for a separate Ad Hoc Committee to better define Subgroup roles and responsibilities.
- Joe Waring and Pete Knollmeyer will continue investigating the use of CO₂ Decontamination for Mixed Waste and Facilities Transition.
- Jay Augustenborg will look into the asbestos remediation issue, as will the D&D Subgroup.
- Proponents of the In Situ Redox Manipulation proposal will meet with Paul Danielson, Dirk Dunning, Bob Cook, and Pete Knollmeyer to resolve their concerns.
- Members will send comments on the Ad Hoc Committee's revised mission, scope, and Management Council roles and responsibilities to Linda Fassbender.

HANFORD SITE TECHNOLOGY COORDINATION GROUP MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING

EESB Snoqualmie Room
Wednesday, April 16, 1997
8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

I. INTRODUCTION/SAFETY/CONTINUOUS PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

Lloyd Piper opened the meeting and asked for introductions around the room. Pam Brown invited Michael Mohar from Bechtel Nevada Remote Sensing Lab to hear about technologies at Hanford.

Lloyd commented that Lockheed Martin Services, Inc. just passed 2 million safe work hours, and site-wide we are approaching 8 million safe work hours. The site-wide goal is 10 million hours. Paul Scott, Dirk Dunning, and Norm Olson shared household safety and health tips: (1) Keep minimum quantities of household chemicals; store and dispose of them safely. (2) Check the ingredients on chemicals to unplug drains; don't mix chemicals. (3) Look in the WalkAmerica brochure for tips for a healthy baby.

Elizabeth Moler has been nominated to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

Nancy Uziemblo reported on legislation for a Technology Certification program for environmental technologies in Washington State. The focus is on radioactive and mixed waste technologies. Two public meetings are planned, one in Seattle on May 13 and one at the Washington Department of Ecology's Kennewick office on May 14. The Washington program will try to model itself after the California program.

The meeting purpose and outcomes were stated as follows:

Purpose

- To learn about the TDI process, the STCG's role, and the Hanford proposal concepts;
- To establish the framework for the STCG as recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee.

Outcomes

- Understanding and endorsement of the TDI proposal concepts;
- Understanding and endorsement of the revised STCG mission, scope and Management Council roles and responsibilities.

II. UPDATES

Greg Eidam (BHI) presented a technology update on the C-Reactor technology demonstrations. The reactor is deteriorating badly, and this project is a joint effort of EM-40 and EM-50 to place it in interim safe storage until it is time for final disposal. The facility footprint will be reduced by 75% as a result of this project, and entry will only be necessary once every five years. At least 20 new technologies will be demonstrated during the course of the project. Six new technologies were demonstrated during the past six months.

Bob Cook asked why the asbestos that was removed was not treated, and Shannon Saget responded that the cost of asbestos conversion was found to be too high compared with the current baseline of removal and disposal at ERDF. Bob stated that DOE should strive for quality improvements over the baseline rather than cost savings. Bob also questioned whether the life-cycle costs of this project included the contingent liability of surveillance and maintenance and loss of land. He felt that long-term costs were not considered correctly, and that the definition of what is included in life-cycle costs must be clarified.

Nancy Uziemblo presented the Communications Committee report. It was suggested that research be done on an issue first (perhaps in a Subgroup discussion), and a champion for that issue should then bring it to the Management Council for discussion. It was also recommended that an external affairs person be invited to the Management Council meetings to help publicize information from the meetings. An action was taken by Debbie Trader to find a PNNL external affairs person for this position.

Nancy also reported on an offer by the Navy to use Department of Defense (DoD) facilities as technology test beds. A technology could be demonstrated at a DoD facility first, then deployed at Hanford. Comments were made that we need to be careful that the technologies are directly applicable to Hanford, and that the DoD facility should be in the Northwest to save on costs. It was also suggested that we need to make sure there is funding at DoD to assist with the demonstration. The demonstration at a DoD facility must add value for Hanford deployment. This opportunity should be approached with a positive attitude.

Shannon Saget reported on the recent National STCG meeting. The Focus Areas need more evidence of commitment to deploy technologies at DOE sites, and the STCGs need to know that the Focus Areas support them. Shannon took an action at the national meeting to compile a list of solutions to common barriers to technology deployment at DOE sites.

III. OREGON OFFICE OF ENERGY MEMBERSHIP - VOTE

A vote was taken to determine if the STCG Management Council should add a voting member to represent the Oregon Office of Energy (OOE). The decision was unanimous that OOE should become a voting member. Dirk Dunning is representing OOE until their official representative is designated.

IV. TDI PROCESS, STCG ROLE, AND PROPOSAL CONCEPTS - VOTE

Dave Biancosino presented an overview of the Technology Deployment Initiative (TDI) process and time line. It was noted that Don Wodrich is one of the 5 members on the Site Evaluation Board that will review the proposals with DOE-Idaho. Dave asked the Management Council to vote on endorsement of the Hanford TDI proposal concepts. The STCG will have the opportunity to review and vote on specific technology deployment plans later. Bob Cook asked if contingent liabilities and long-term costs (including land costs) have been considered in the cost analyses. Dave stated that there are forms and calculations that are required to be filled out in the proposal and that the Corps of Engineers is doing the cost analyses. It is too late to require that the methodology be changed for the current proposals. However, Dave took the action to communicate the issue to DOE-HQ so that more definitive life-cycle costs could be included in next year's TDI proposals.

Jerry White noted that on one hand we are submitting a TDI proposal on asbestos conversion, but on the other hand we are saying that EM-50 won't fund this technology further because it costs too much. We are sending conflicting messages.

Tom Engel was concerned with the TDI process. It seems that industry has not been appropriately involved because of the short time frame. He asked when DOE-RL heard about the call for proposals. Dave took the action to provide him with a time line. Dave indicated that Hanford's technology needs have been published, and that many calls from industry have been received since the TDI call for proposals came out. Pam Brown suggested that we will have to improve communications between sites, since we have to work together on some of the proposals.

Presentations were made by each of the Subgroup Leads or their designates on the proposal concepts endorsed by each Subgroup. After discussions in each area, a vote was taken to approve the proposal concepts for which there were no show-stopper issues. It was also suggested that three additional proposals obtain sponsors and be submitted: CO₂ Decontamination, Asbestos Conversion, and Sodium Reuse. The proposal concepts, including the three additional ones, were endorsed unanimously.

There were three proposal concepts where major issues were raised. These were discussed and voted on separately.

- In Situ Redox Manipulation - Concerns were expressed that: 1) the chromium source in the 100-D Area is not known, and 2) this deployment is only a partial resolution of the problem because it only covers 500 feet of riverfront. The vote was 4 yes, 4 no, and 2 abstentions. It was decided to try to resolve the remaining issues offline prior to Lloyd signing the proposal. It was noted that the DOE EM-40 Program emphatically supports this technology.
- Laser Ablation/Mass Spectroscopy - There was a concern that there is no DOE sponsor, although there is a contractor sponsor (Lockheed). The TWRS Program's concern is that the

benefit gained is not worth the money spent. It was decided to continue discussions with the DOE TWRS Program.

- Tank Integrity - There was a concern raised on the need for tank integrity information. Several members expressed their views that this information is important. The vote passed with 8 yes, 1 no, and 1 abstention.

V. AD HOC COMMITTEE - VOTE

There was no time left to discuss and vote on this item. Members were asked to send their comments to Linda Fassbender. The discussion and vote will take place at the next meeting.

VI. WRAP-UP

The next meeting will be held on May 21, 1997, from 8:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. in the EESB Snoqualmie Room.

Future Agenda Items

- Ad Hoc Committee's Revised Mission, Scope, and Management Council Roles and Responsibilities - VOTE
- Deployment Center Status
- Subgroup Roles and Responsibilities
- Feedback from Focus Areas on Our Technology Needs (perhaps at the June meeting)